

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

Con

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/574,289	01/16/2007	Robert Owen	288922US0PCT	5509
22850 7590 02/08/2008 OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET			EXAMINER	
			LANGEL, WAYNE A	
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		1793		
	•			
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/08/2008	ELECTRONIC

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com oblonpat@oblon.com jgardner@oblon.com

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
		10/574,289	OWEN ET AL.			
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
		Wayne Langel	1793			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address			
WHIC - Exter after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DANSIONS of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Poperiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tir vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from 1. cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 Ja	anuary 2008.				
<i>,</i> —	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.					
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Dispositi	on of Claims					
4)🖂	Claim(s) <u>1,3,5-9 and 13-16</u> is/are pending in th	e application.	•			
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
•—	5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☑ Claim(s) <u>1,3,5-9 and 14-16</u> is/are rejected.					
,	7) Claim(s) 13 is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.					
ا ال	are subject to recursion and a	1				
Applicat	ion Papers					
	The specification is objected to by the Examine					
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on <u>04 January 2008</u> is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11)	11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.					
	under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
•		priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a	a)-(d) or (f).			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:						
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
* \$	See the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not receive	ea.			
Attachmer	nt(s)					
	ce of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summar Paper No(s)/Mail D				
3) Infor	ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) er No(s)/Mail Date	5) Notice of Informal 6) Other:				

Application/Control Number: 10/574,289

Art Unit: 1793

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 3, 5-9 and 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Minamikawa et al in view of Devos et al. Minamikawa et al disclose at col. 1, lines 51-54 that various techniques may be used in combination for purifying hydrogen peroxide, including a filtration process using a membrane in combination with an adsorption process using a resin. The difference between the process disclosed by Minamikawa et al, and that recited in claims 1, 3, 8 and 14-16, is that Minamikawa et al do not specifically disclose that the membrane should be a reverse osmosis membrane. Devos et al disclose at col. 2, lines 4-7 that various techniques may be used to purify hydrogen peroxide solutions, including reverse osmosis. It would be obvious from Devos et al to employ a reverse osmosis membrane as the membrane in the process of Minamikawa et al. since one of ordinary skill in the art would expect that any known or suitable type of purification membrane would function as the membrane. Regarding claims 5-7 and 9, Minamikawa et al suggest at col. 2, lines 36-46 t6hat UV (ultraviolet light) may be used as a purification technique. Applicants' argument, that nothing in the refernces discloses or suggests the specific combination of reverse osmosis membrane purification followed by at least one other purification selected from the group consisting of exposure to ultraviolet light, exposure to ozone, and contact with at least one adsorption resin, is not convincing, since there is no evidence on record of unexpected

Application/Control Number: 10/574,289

Art Unit: 1793

results which would emanate from a combination of purification steps in the order as recited in applicants' claims, as opposed to the reverse order.

Claim 13 is objected to as based on a rejected parent claim, and would be allowed if written in independent form.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Wayne Langel whose telephone number is 571-272-1353. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 8 am - 3:30 pm Eastern Time.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stanley Silverman can be reached on 571-272-1358. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000. Wayne A, Jang & Wayne Langel

Application/Control Number: 10/574,289

Art Unit: 1793

Primary Examiner Art Unit 1793